

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-28 were pending and rejected. In this response, no claim has been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 14, and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 3-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087728 to Deshpande, et al. (“Deshpande”) in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0110299 to Larsson, et al. (“Larsson”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,818,364 to Hintzman, et al. (“Hintzman”).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-28 include limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by Deshpande, Larsson, and Hintzman, individually or in combination. Specifically, for example, independent claim 1 as amended includes limitations that a client has capabilities of reconstructing the codestream from a non-JPEG 2000 compliant format into a JPEG 2000 compliant codestream by adjusting values of a variety of markers including at least TLM and PLM markers to reflect the characteristics of the images in view of the JPEG 2000 standard, including making the markers to be JPEG 2000 compatible. As a result, an ordinary JPEG 2000 decoder can be used to decode the reconstructed codestream. The support for these limitations can be found throughout the specification of the present application, such as, for example, pages 20-22 of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are absent from Deshpande and Larsson, individually or in combination. None of the clients of Deshpande and Larsson have such capabilities as described above, particularly, the JPEG 2000 codestream reconstruction capabilities.

Although the Office Action acknowledged that Deshpande and Larsson failed to disclose the limitations as set forth above, the Office Action contended that col. 2, lines 27-35 of Hintzman disclose such limitations (see 7/12/07 Office Action, page 5).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited section of Hintzman discloses that a video decoder must be able to read and remove the markers. Specifically, Hintzman states:

“Adding even further complexity, there generally are headers and control markers 107 embedded in the compressed JPEG/MPEG data stream. These markers are reserved data patterns; that is, reserved, particular strings of ones and zeros, that are embedded at byte boundaries in the data stream. Examples would be START OF SCAN, START OF IMAGE, END OF IMAGE, and RESTART markers. Thus, a JPEG Huffman decoder must detect marker presence and remove the marker as well as any padding bits that may have been added to align the marker to a byte boundary.”

(Hintzman, col. 2, lines 26-35, emphasis added)

Thus, the cited section of Hintzman discloses that a video decoder must detect and remove the markers, which is not the same as modifying markers so that a video stream is compliant with another standard other than the original one. It appears that the cited section of Hintzman is more related to interpreting the markers rather than modifying the markers. Specifically, there is no disclosure within Hintzman of modifying markers to enable a video stream to be converted from one standard to another standard such that an ordinary decoder associated with the new standard can decode the modified video stream.

In addition, there is no disclosure or suggestion within Deshpande, Larsson, and Hintzman to combine with each other. Even if they were combined, such a combination still lacks the limitations set forth above. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 as amended is patentable over Deshpande, Larsson, and Hintzman.

Similarly, independent claims 3, 14, and 22 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for reasons similar to those set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claims

3, 14, and 22 are patentable over Deshpande, Larsson, and Hintzman. Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, for reasons similar to those set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are also patentable over Deshpande, Larsson, and Hintzman. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call/email the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 11, 2007

/Kevin G. Shao/

Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,095
kevin_shao@bstz.com

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300